

Appln No. 10/067,552

Amdt date December 24, 2003

Reply to Office action of October 10, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and reexamination of Claims 1 - 8 which are now in the application is hereby requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 3 and 6 - 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sheem. The Examiner has also rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Sheem. However, the Examiner has found Claims 4 and 8 to contain allowable subject matter.

The Applicants' independent Claim 1 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) ... An optical coupling structure to connect an optical fiber and a plane optical waveguide, comprising: a core having same cross-sectional dimensions as core cross sectional dimensions of the plane optical waveguide at one side connecting to the plane optical waveguide, and having width and depth smaller than a core diameter of the optical fiber at a fiber interface side connecting to the optical fiber wherein at least one of width and depth of the core is tapered along an optical axis proximate to the fiber interface side; and, clad to surround the core.

The Applicants' independent Claim 6 calls for (underlining added for emphasis) ... A plane optical circuit to optically connect to optical fiber at a side surface of the plane optical circuit, comprising: a core having a first refractive index, at least one of width and depth of the core being tapered along optical axis in a part proximate to the side surface, the width and the depth of the core at the side surface being smaller than a core diameter of the optical fiber; and, clad having second

Appln No. 10/067,552

Amdt date December 24, 2003

Reply to Office action of October 10, 2003

refractive index smaller than the first refractive index to surround the core.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated by Sheem under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Sheem, while providing for an optical fiber interconnecting structure for connecting an optical fiber to an optical channel waveguide, has the shape and size of tapered core-extension 6 at its optical fiber end face becoming identical with the shape and size of core 7 of optical fiber 5, not smaller than the core diameter of the optical fiber.


Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Claims 1 and 6 are not anticipated by Sheem under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 2, 3 and 5 are dependent on Claim 1 and Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 6. As such, these claims are believed allowable based upon Claims 1 and 6 respectively.

Therefore in view of the above remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP



By

Richard J. Paciulan

Reg. No. 28,248

626/795-9900

RJP/cah

CAH PASS39649.2-*12/13/03 3:44 PM
CAH PASS39649.2-*12/2/03 3:42 PM